UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

RAVIN CROSSBOWS, LLC,)	CASE NO. 5:18-cv-1729
PLAINTIFF,)	JUDGE SARA LIOI
·)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
HUNTER'S MANUFACTURING)	
COMPANY, INC., d/b/a TenPoint)	
Crossbow Technologies,)	
)	
DEFENDANT.)	

Plaintiff Ravin Crossbows, LLC ("Ravin") commenced this action against defendant Hunter's Manufacturing Company, Inc., d/b/a TenPoint Crossbow Technologies ("TenPoint") asserting subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) and seeking a declaratory judgment with respect to Ravin's exercise of its alleged rights under a license agreement between the parties. As the Court took matters under advisement, it questioned whether the jurisdictional amount was satisfied and directed the parties to brief the issue. Ravin filed its brief (Doc. No. 44), supported by a declaration (Doc. No. 45), but TenPoint's counsel advised by a telephone call to the Court's chambers that defendant would not be filing a brief in opposition.

Courts have "an independent obligation to determine whether subject-matter jurisdiction exists, even in the absence of a challenge from any party." *Freeland v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 632 F.3d 250, 252 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Arbaugh v. Y & H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 514, 126 S. Ct. 1235, 163 L. Ed. 2d 1097 (2006)). To dismiss an action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based on the amount in controversy, "[i]t must appear to a legal certainty that the claim is really

for less than the jurisdictional amount[.]" St. Paul Mercury Indem. Co. v. Red Cab Co., 303 U.S.

283, 289, 58 S. Ct. 586, 82 L. Ed. 845 (1938).

Based only upon the unrefuted representations in Ravin's brief and its supporting

declaration as to the allegations on the face of the complaint (now amended), the Court is satisfied

that the requisite amount in controversy to support an action under diversity jurisdiction has been

pleaded.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 7, 2019

HONORABLE SARA LIOI UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2